UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/020,341	10/29/2001	Julie D. Bennett	MSFT116734	1655

26389 7590 06/16/2005

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER	
CHOW, CHIH CHING	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/020,341	BENNETT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chih-Ching Chow	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 March 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-44* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-44* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 October 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to amendment dated March 07, 2005.

2. Per Applicants' request, the Specification, claims 1, 3-4, 6-11, 13-19, 25-33, 36-42, and 44 have been amended.

3. Claims 1-44 remain pending.

Response to Amendment

4. Applicants' amendment dated 03/07/2005, responding to the 12/14/2004 Office action provided in the objection of Specification. The examiner has reviewed the updated Specification respectfully.

5. The objection to the Specification is hereby withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendment to the Specification.

6. Applicants' amendment for Claims 1, 3-4, 6-11, 13-19, 25-33, 36-42 and 44 have been fully considered respectfully by the examiner but they are not persuasive.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicants' arguments for Claims 1-44 have been fully considered respectfully by the examiner but they are not persuasive.

8. Applicants' Summary section (page 12 of the REMARKS) is very helpful in clarifying the unclear part of the Specification, they should be added to the Specification.

9. 35 USC § 112 (1st paragraph) Rejections

"Claims 10, 11, 25, 28, and 37 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention". (REMARKS, page 15, 4th paragraph) -- The 35 USC § 112 (1st paragraph) Rejections for Claims 10, 11, 25, 28, and 37 are hereby withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendment to the those claims.

10. 35 USC § 112 (2nd paragraph) Rejections

"Claims 1, 3-4, 6-11, 13-16, 19, 25-28, 30-33, 36-37, 39-42, and 44 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention". (REMARKS, page 16, 2nd paragraph) -- The 35 USC § 112 (2nd paragraph) Rejections for above Claims are hereby withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendment to the those Claims.

11. 35 USC § 102 Rejections

Applicants' arguments are basically in the following points:

- Rettig's "identify precisely the appropriate language resource and where it is located" is not the same as current application's "obtaining and comparing the resources contents of the default and current default resource modules to dynamically verify resource compatibility with an operating system" (REMARKS, page 18, last paragraph).

Examiner's Response: Rettig's disclosure teaches obtaining and comparing the resources contents, otherwise how can his disclosure to 'identify precisely the appropriate language resource and where it is located' see Rittig's column 3, lines 16-17. His disclosure also obtains and loads resources from the desired

language-specific resource module (paragraph 7 of current application), see Rettig's column 2, lines 24-29, "it may be desirable in some instances for the same installation of an operating system to provide, transparently to the user, appropriate resources for a number of languages. This would allow users of various tongues to share the same computer. The user would log on, select a desired language, and use the computer, thereafter seeing all resource-based operating system features in the chosen language." - the Examiner believes both Rettig's disclosure and the current application are trying to solve the same problem, Rettig's disclosure covers the current application's teachings.

- Hassett's teaching is "a method of distributing information to multiple client devices on a network in which the user of a particular type of algorithm is used to compute a checksum, namely the message digest algorithm know as MD5", "Hassett is not analogous prior art" (REMARKS page 19, 4th paragraph).

Examiner's Response: This is exactly why it's been recited in the Examiner's first Office Action, as mentioned above, the checksum technique is a well-known technique for the people in the art to uniquely identify a program/module, it's obvious for the people in the art to combine Rettig's disclosure with Hassett's disclosure in order to 'uniquely identify a data item', see Hassett's column 28, lines 35-36. Therefore Hassett's disclosure is an analogous prior art.

12. The Examiner is maintaining the 35 USC § 102 and the 35 USC 103 Rejections. The Examiner is adding Drawing rejection due to the amended claims.

For the Applicants' convenience they are listed as below, with the amendments requested by the Applicants.

Drawings

13. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the drawing must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered. The current drawing doesn't show all the features in the amended claims, for example,

- In Claim 1, comparing the resource contents, Fig. 2A shows comparing the resource modules;
- after the resource contents match (checksum comparison), the drawing shows load the alternate resource module and then 'end' (212). However, the claim 11 does the comparison again.
- In Claim 12, the 'tracking compatibility information' and 'information store' are not shown in any of the figures?
- Claim 25 has a different processing sequence as Claims 1, 28, or 37 (Claim 25 checks version numbers first then check resource contents, whereas Claims 1, 28, and 37 check resource contents first then check version numbers), the figures don't match with any of the claims ...etc.

The Applicants should have a **thorough** review between the drawings and the claims (if the resource contents are the same, is the version comparison still necessary?), a corrected drawings is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

14. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

15. Claims 1-8, 10-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,252,589 by Bjorn C. Retting et al. (hereinafter "Retting").

CLAIM	Retting
1. A method for dynamically verifying resource compatibility with an operating system, the method comprising: (a) obtaining a request to load a resource from an alternate resource module, wherein the alternate resource module corresponds to a selected interface;	For claim 1, item (a), see Retting's column 1, lines 19-25, "A **resource** may be either standard or user-defined. The data in a standard resource describes an icon, cursor, menu, dialog box, bitmap, enhanced metafile, font, accelerator table, message-table entry, string-table entry, or version. A user-defined resource contains any data required by a specific application." Also see column 3, lines 1-5, "there is at least one type of operating system that now provides for language **selection** on a limited basis. This operating system provides **separate text files for each language**. When a process requires a

(b) obtaining a first resource content of a default resource module from which the alternate resource module was localized;

(c) obtaining a second resource content of a current default resource module;

(d) comparing the first resource content and the second resource content; and

(e) loading the requested resource from the alternate resource module if the first resource content is the same as the second resource content.

text file resource in a particular language, the operating system addresses the appropriate file. The **user can select his default language** of choice through a system variable (*request to load a resource*)." For items (b)-(e), see Retting, column 3, lines 8-17, "at least one current operating system (Windows.RTM.) provides some support for the creation of language-specific libraries, for example text messages. A system variable is defined indicating the **locale** (Note, the locale of a system is not a language setting. Locale is a mixture of language and location) of the operating system installation and this variable can be used by the applications running on the operating system to format messages specifically for the current language (*localized*). This requires, however, that the process (the application) **identify precisely the appropriate language** (*obtaining and comparing*) resource and where it is located", also in Retting's abstract, "A user is enabled to **select** a language for the user interface (*selected interface*) and the **resource loader** will automatically redirect calls for resources to the appropriate resources. (*loading*)." -- in Retting's teaching, alternate resource module is localized, obtained, compared and loaded if it's an appropriate language resource module.

2. The method of Claim 1, wherein the alternate resource module corresponds to a selected interface language and the resource modules are language specific.	For the feature of claim 1 see claim 1 rejection. For the rest of the feature in claim 2 see Retting, column 1, lines 59-65, "A process requiring a resource sends the finder a **resource module** handle and the resource name, type, and optionally, a language ID. The latter specifies a **language specific resource** in the resources defined by the resource module handle. The finder returns a handle to the specified resource's info block and the process can call a **resource loader** to place the resource in memory (*loading*)."
3. The method of Claim 1, wherein comparing the first resource content and the second resource content includes comparing a representation of each of the default resource module and the current default resource module.	For the feature of claim 1 see claim 1 rejection. See claim 1 rejection (*localized and comparing*).
4. The method of Claim 3, wherein the representation is a unique number. 5. The method of Claim 4, wherein the unique number is a checksum.	For claims 4 and 5. The unique number is a checksum (as specified in claim 5). 'checksum' is well known to be a calculated value which can be used to verify data for the presence of errors that can occur when data is transmitted or when it is written to disk (to uniquely identify a file). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use checksum as the unique identifier for a resource module.
6. The method of Claim 5, wherein	For the feature of claim 5 see claim 5

obtaining the second resource content includes obtaining the checksum from the current default resource module.	rejection. A checksum value for a resource module can always be obtained; for example, in UNIX™ environment, it can be obtained by executing the 'chksum' command. The checksum value can be stored in a file. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to obtain the resource content module along with its checksum value.
7. The method of Claim 5, wherein obtaining the second resource content includes calculating the checksum from the current default resource module.	For the feature of claim 5 see claim 5 rejection. Again the checksum value can be obtained via a 'chksum' command; see claim 6 rejection.
8. The method of Claim 5, wherein obtaining the first resource content includes obtaining the checksum from the default resource module.	For the feature of claim 5 see claim 5 rejection. See claim 6 rejection.
10. The method of Claim 1, further comprising loading the requested resource from the current default resource module if the first resource content is not the same as the second resource content.	Same as claim 1 rejection and the 112(1), and 112(2), rejection items 6 and 8.
11. The method of Claim 1, further comprising tracking compatibility information as to whether the first resource content is the same as the second resource content.	For the feature of claim 1 see claim 1 rejection. See Retting's FIG 4, and column 4, lines 31-32, "A resource handler 230 is used by a process 210 to obtain access to a **resource datum** 220." Here the **resource datum** can include any 'compatibility information' for the

	resource module, such as O.S. version, checksum, size, creating date, owner, ...etc.; each of the data items can be created as a **record** in the resource datum set.
12. The method of Claim 11, wherein tracking the compatibility information includes storing the compatibility information in an information store.	For the feature of claim 11 see claim 11 rejection. The 'resource datum' cited above has the same function as the 'information store'.
13. The method of Claim 1, further comprising: (a) obtaining version information of the default resource module; (b) obtaining version information of the current default resource module; (c) comparing the version information of the default resource module and the current default resource module; and (d) loading the requested resource from the alternate resource module when the version information of the default resource module and the current default resource module are the same.	For the feature of claim 1 see claim 1 rejection. Current version of operating system can always been obtained, for example, in UNIX™ system, the command '**uname**' will return a current running operating system version number. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to obtain version information via system commands (items a, b), assuming the version information is part of the compatibility information (see claim 11 rejection), which is stored in the 'information store' as recited in claim 12. It's also obvious to **search through** the resource datum (*compatibility information store*) and compare the version numbers (item c), if they are the same, that means they are running in the **compatible** operating system and loading the alternate resource won't cause any problem (item d). On the other hand, if the version numbers are not compatible, that means they are not running in the

	same version of O.S. therefore loading the alternate resource module would cause problem, thus the alternate resource module should NOT be loaded.
14. The method of Claim 13, further comprising: (a) determining whether the current default resource module or default resource module has been updated if the respective version information is not the same; (b) obtaining compatibility information for the current default resource module and the default resource module if no update has occurred; and (c) loading the requested resource based on the compatibility information.	For the feature of claim 13 see claim 13 rejection. For item (a), the version number can be obtained and stored (see claim rejection 11 and 13), the datum (*compatibility information*) can be stored, searched, and compared. For the rest of the claim 14 features see claim 13 rejection.
15. The method of Claim 14, wherein loading the requested resource based on the compatibility information includes loading the requested resource from the alternate resource module if the compatibility information indicates that the current default resource module is compatible with the default resource module from which the alternate resource module was localized.	For the feature of claim 14 see claim 14 rejection. For the rest of the claim 15 features see claim 13 rejection.
16. The method of Claim 14, wherein loading the requested resource based on the compatibility information includes loading the requested resource from the default resource module if the compatibility information indicates that	For the feature of claim 14 see claim 14 rejection. For the rest of the claim 16 features see claim 13 rejection.

the current default resource module is not compatible with the default resource module from which the alternate resource module was localized.	
17. The method of Claim 14, wherein determining whether the current default resource module or default resource module has been updated includes searching an information store holding compatibility information.	For the feature of claim 14 see claim 14 rejection. For the rest of the claim 17 features see claim 11 and 13 rejections.
18. The method of Claim 17, wherein determining whether the current default resource module or default resource module has been updated includes determining that the current default resource module or default resource module has not been updated if searching the information store holding compatibility information reveals an absence of compatibility information.	For the feature of claim 17 see claim 17 rejection. The resource datum can also include all the update information. For the rest of the claim 18 features see claim 11 and 13 rejections.
19. The method of Claim 18, further comprising creating a record in the information store corresponding to the version information of the current default resource module and the default resource module if the current default resource module or default resource module has been updated.	For the feature of claim 18 see claim 18 rejection. Any data item can be created as a record in the information store, including the version number. See claim 11 rejection.
20. The method of Claim 14, wherein the compatibility information is obtained from an information store used for tracking compatibility information.	For the feature of claim 14 see claim 14 rejection. For the rest of the claim 20 features see claim 11, 12 rejections.

21. The method of Claim 1, wherein the operating system includes a plurality of alternate resource modules.	For the feature of claim 1 see claim 1 rejection. See Retting column 2, lines 35-36, "to provide **multilingual support**, one option might be to provide a **different set of binary files** *(alternate resource modules)* for each language."
22. The method of Claim 1, wherein the alternate resource module is selected by the user.	For the feature of claim 1 see claim 1 rejection. See Retting column 2, lines 23-29, "The **user** would log on, **select a desired language**, and use the computer, thereafter seeing all resource-based operating system features in the chosen language."
23. A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method recited in any one of Claims 1-22.	Retting's disclosure definitely includes a computer-readable medium (so it can read different language resource modules) to perform any one of Claims 1-22.
24. A computer system having a processor, and a memory in an operating environment, the computer system for performing the method recited in any one of Claims 1-22.	Retting's disclosure definitely includes a processor so it can process user's selection.
25. A method for dynamically verifying resource module compatibility with an operating system, wherein the resource modules include language-specific data such that a default resource module corresponds to a default interface language and one or more alternate resource modules correspond to a selected interface language, the method	For item (a), (f), (g), (h) and (j) see claim 1, 2, and 18 rejections, for items (b)-(e) see claim 13 and 18 rejections, for item (i) see claim 11-13 rejections.

comprising:

(a) obtaining a request to load a language-specific resource from an alternate resource module localized from a default resource module;

(b) obtaining version information of the default resource module;

(c) obtaining version information of a current default resource module;

(d) comparing the version information of the default resource module and the current default resource module;

(e) determining whether the current default resource module or default resource module has been updated if the version information of the current default resource module and the alternate resource module are not the same, wherein determining whether the current default or default resource module has been updated includes:

(f) obtaining a first resource content of the default resource module;

(g) obtaining a second resource content of the current default resource module;

(h) comparing the first resource content of the default resource module and the second resource content;

(i) tracking compatibility information as to whether the first resource content is the same as the second resource content; and

(j) loading the requested language-specific resource from the alternate resource module if the first resource

content is the same as the second resource content.

26. The method of Claim 25, further comprising loading the requested language-specific resource from the alternate resource module when the version information of the default resource module and the current default resource module is the same.

For the feature of claim 25 see claim 25 rejection. For the rest of the claim 26 feature see claim 13 rejection.

27. The method of Claim 25, further comprising obtaining compatibility information for the current default resource module and the default resource module if the current default or default resource module has been updated and, based on the compatibility information, loading the requested language-specific resource.

For the feature of claim 25 see claim 25 rejection. For the rest of the claim 27 feature see claim 13 rejection.

28. A computer system for dynamically verifying that a resource module is compatible with an operating system, the computer system comprising:
(a) a resource loader for loading a resource from a resource module;
(b) a current default resource module including at least one resource, wherein the current default resource module has a first resource content; and
(c) an alternate resource module including one or more resources localized from a default resource module, wherein the default resource modle has a second resource content

See claim 1 and 13 rejections.

from which the one or more resources included in the alternate resource module were localized;
(d) wherein the resource loader loads the one or more resources from the alternate resource module when the second resource content is the same as the first resource content.

29. The computer system of Claim 28, wherein the alternate resource module corresponds to a selected interface language and the one or more resources are language specific.

For the feature of claim 28 see claim 28 rejection. For the rest of the claim 29 features see claim 2 rejection.

30. The computer system of Claim 28, wherein the first and the second resource contents are represented as unique numbers.

For the feature of claim 28 see claim 28 rejection. For the rest of the claim 30 features see claim 4 rejection.

31. The computer system of Claim 30, wherein the unique numbers are a checksum of the respective first and second resource contents.

For the feature of claim 30 see claim 30 rejection. For the rest of the claim 31 features see claim 5 rejection.

32. The computer system of Claim 31, wherein the current default resource module contains the checksum of the first resource content.

For the feature of claim 30 see claim 30 rejection. For the rest of the claim 32 features see claim 6 rejection.

33. The computer system of Claim 31, wherein the default resource module contains the checksum of the second resource content.

For the feature of claim 30 see claim 30 rejection. For the rest of the claim 33 features see claim 10 rejection.

34. The computer system of Claim 28,

For the feature of claim 28 see claim 28

wherein the operating system includes a plurality of alternate resource modules.	rejection. For the rest of the claim 34 features see claim 21 rejection.
35. The computer system of Claim 28, wherein the alternate resource module is selected by the user.	For the feature of claim 28 see claim 28 rejection. For the rest of the claim 35 features see claim 22 rejection.
36. The computer system of Claim 28, further comprising a registry resource version database holding compatibility information of the current default resource module and the default resource module from which the alternate resource module was localized, wherein the resource loader utilizes the compatibility information to determine whether the alternate resource module is compatible with the operating system.	For the feature of claim 28 see claim 28 rejection. For the rest of the claim 36 features see claim 11 and 13 rejection (*registry resource version database has the same function as the information store*).
37. A computer-readable medium having computer-executable modules, comprising: (a) a resource loader module for loading a resource from a resource module; (b) a current default resource module including at least one resource having a first resource content; (c) an alternate resource module including one or more resources localized from a default resource module having a second resource content from which the one or more resources in the alternate resource module were localized; and (d) wherein the resource loader loads	Retting's disclosure definitely includes a computer-executable medium so it can **execute** a language resource module selection update. For the rest of the features of claim 37, see claim 1 rejection.

the resource from the alternate resource module when the second resource content is the same as the first resource content.	
38. The computer-readable medium of Claim 37, wherein the alternate resource module corresponds to a user-selected interface language and the one or more resources are language specific.	For the feature of claim 37 see claim 37 rejection. For the rest of the claim 38 features see claim2 and 22 rejections.
39. The computer-readable medium of Claim 37, wherein the first and second resource contents are represented as unique numbers.	For the feature of claim 37 see claim 37 rejection. For the rest of the claim 39 features see claim 4 rejection.
40. The computer-readable medium of Claim 39, wherein the unique numbers are a checksum of the respective first and second resource content.	For the feature of claim 39 see claim 39 rejection. For the rest of the claim 40 features see claim 5 rejection.
41. The computer-readable medium of Claim 40, wherein the current default resource module contains the checksum of the first resource content.	For the feature of claim 40 see claim 40 rejection. For the rest of the claim 41 features see claim 6 rejection.
42. The computer-readable medium of Claim 40, wherein the alternate resource module contains the checksum of the second resource content.	For the feature of claim 40 see claim 40 rejection. For the rest of the claim 42 features see claim 6 rejection.
43. The computer-readable medium of Claim 37, wherein the operating system includes a plurality of alternate resource modules.	For the feature of claim 37 see claim 37 rejection. For the rest of the claim 43 features see claim 21 rejection.

44. The computer-readable medium of Claim 37, further comprising a registry resource version database holding version information of the current default resource module, version information of the default resource module from which the one or more resources of the alternate resource module were localized, and compatibility information for the current default resource module and the default resource module, wherein the resource loader utilizes the compatibility information to determine whether the alternate resource module is compatible with the operating system.	For the feature of claim 37 see claim 37 rejection. For the rest of the claim 39 features see claim 36, 11-13 rejections (again, the registry resource version database has the same function as the **information store**).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No 6,252,589 by Bjorn C. Retting et al. (hereinafter "Retting"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,807,558 by Gregory P. Hassett et al (hereinafter "Hassett").

CLAIM	Retting / Hassett
9. The method of Claim 5, wherein the checksum is calculated using an MD5-message digest algorithm.	For the feature of claim 5 see claim 5 rejection. Retting teaches all aspects of claim 9, but he does not mention 'MD5' specifically, however, Hassett teaches it in an analogous prior art. In Hassett, column 25, lines 33-36, "The **MD5 checksum** of the data item (not including the wrapper). Needs to be generated by the feed (to allow for item-based fetching). Always on the UNCOMPRESSED data. ARTI- Binary -- Article_IDs are a property of the data CLE.sub.-- item and set by the feed. The **MD5 check-ID_MD5 sum** (hexadecimal) of the Article ID is used instead of the Article ID string itself as an optimization." And column 28, lines 35-39, "**MD5** - The combination of category id and **MD5 checksum can uniquely identify any LCM data item** (actually, just the MD5 is enough to uniquely identify a data item, however the category ID is needed by LCM to select the correct table). By requesting a URL with the following syntax, any LCM item can be accessed from a browser." It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to supplement Retting's disclosure of the obtaining/comparing/loading resource modules by using MD5-checksum taught by Hassett, for the purpose of uniquely identifying any software (see Hassett column 28, lines 35-36).

Conclusion

18. The following summarizes the status of the claims:

35 USC § 102 rejection: 1-8, 10-44

35 USC § 103 rejection: 9

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chih-Ching Chow whose telephone number is 571-272-3693. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on 571-272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **TC2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.**

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chih-Ching Chow

Examiner

Art Unit 2192

June 13, 2005

C.C.

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER